

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CRIMINAL NO.  
04-10053-RCL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

VICTOR ARROYO  
ANGEL LUIS RIVERA  
ONIX FIGUEROA

**INTERIM STATUS REPORT**

June 30, 2004

DEIN, M.J.

An Interim Status Conference was held before this court on Wednesday, June 30, 2004 pursuant to the provisions of Local Rule 116.5(A). Based on that conference, this court enters the following report and orders, to wit:

1. The government has provided discovery which is being reviewed by the defendants.
2. The government anticipates that, unless there is a stipulation regarding the drugs involved in this case, it will offer expert testimony regarding the drugs at issue. The government will provide expert discovery 21 days before trial. The defendants will provide reciprocal expert discovery 7 days before trial.
3. The defendants do not anticipate filing any discovery or dispositive motions.
4. In this court's view, this is not a case involving unusual or complex issues for which an early joint conference of the district judge and the magistrate judge with counsel of record would be useful.

5. In this court's view, this is not a case involving features which would warrant special attention or modification of the standard schedule, except as provided herein.
6. It is too early to determine whether a trial will be necessary.
7. This court finds and concludes, pursuant to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8) and Section 6(b)(8) of the Plan for Prompt Disposition of Criminal Cases in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts (Statement of Time Limits Adopted by the Court and Procedures for Implementing Them, Effective July 1, 1980), that the interests of justice, i.e., review of the case, review of the evidence, and consideration of alternatives concerning how best to proceed with this matter, outweighs the best interests of the public and the defendants for a trial within seventy days of the return of an indictment.


Accordingly, it is hereby ordered that, pursuant to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8) and Section 6(b)(8) of the Plan for Prompt Disposition of Criminal Cases in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts (Statement of Time Limits Adopted by the Court and Procedures for Implementing Them, Effective July 1, 1980), the Clerk of this Court enter excludable time for the period of June 30, 2004 - September 15, 2004, that being the time between the Interim Status Conference and the Final Status Conference.<sup>1</sup>

8. Based upon the prior orders of this court dated March 9, 2004, April 16, 2004 and the order entered herewith, at the time of the Final Status Conference on September 15, 2004, there will be zero (0) days of non-excludable time under the Speedy Trial Act, and seventy (70) days remaining under the Speedy Trial Act in which this case must be tried.
9. **A Final Status Conference has been scheduled for September 15, 2004 at 10:00 a.m. Counsel for the respective parties shall file a**

---

<sup>1</sup> The parties are hereby advised that under the provisions of Rule 2(b) of the Rules for United States Magistrates in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, any party may move for reconsideration by a district judge of the determination(s) and order(s) set forth herein within ten (10) days after receipt of a copy of this order, unless a different time is prescribed by this court or the district judge. The party seeking reconsideration shall file with the Clerk of this Court, and serve upon all parties, a written notice of the motion which shall specifically designate the order or part thereof to be reconsidered and the basis for the objection thereto. The district judge, upon timely motion, shall reconsider the magistrate's order and set aside any portion thereof found to be clearly erroneous in fact or contrary to law. The parties are further advised that the United States Court of Appeals for this Circuit has indicated that failure to comply with this rule shall preclude further appellate review. See Keating v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 848 F.2d 271 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. March 31, 1988); United States v. Emiliano Valencia-Copete, 792 F.2d 4 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1986); Park Motor Mart, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co., 616 F.2d 603 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1980); United States v. Vega, 678 F.2d 376, 378-379 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1982); Scott v. Schweiker, 702 F.2d 13, 14 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1983); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 106 S. Ct. 466 (1985).

**Joint Memorandum addressing the matters set forth in LR 116.5(C)(1) through (9) before the close of business no less than THREE business days prior to that Status Conference. In addition, the parties shall include in the Joint Memorandum not only the periods of excludable time that are applicable, but also the amount of time remaining under the Speedy Trial Act before trial must commence, as well as the total amount of time which has been excluded.**

  
Judith Gail Dein  
United States Magistrate Judge